Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
NOV 23 1984
ALEXANDER L. STEVAS
CLERK

No. 84-822

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1984

AMERICAN NATIONAL BANK AND TRUST COMPANY OF CHICAGO, A NATIONAL BANKING ASSOCIATION, WALTER E. HELLER INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION AND RONALD J. GRAYHECK,

Petitioners,

vs.

HAROCO, INC., A CORPORATION, ROMAN CERAMICS, INC., A CORPORATION, CALIFORNIA ORIGINALS, INC., A CORPORATION AND MIKE WAYNE DISTILLED PRODUCTS CO., A CORPORATION,

Respondents.

MEMORANDUM OF RESPONDENTS

ARAM A. HARTUNIAN
(Counsel of Record)
HARTUNIAN FUTTERMAN &
HOWARD, CHTD.
Suite 4005
55 East Monroe
Chicago, IL 60603
(312) 372-6475
Attorneys for Respondents

Pandick Midwest, Inc. Chicago • 454-7600

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

PARTIES TO THE ACTION

The identities of the Respondents are correctly identified in the Petition. They have no parents, subsidiaries and affiliates (except each other).

RESPONDENTS ACQUIESCE TO THE PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

While Respondents disagree with Petitioners' statement of the Question Presented For Review,[1] Respondents agree with Petitioners that a writ of certiorari should be granted, in light of the conflict between the decision of the Seventh Circuit in this case and the decisions of the Second Circuit in *Sedima, S.P.R.L.* v. *Imrex Co.*, No. 83-7965 (2d Cir. July 25, 1984), *petition for cert. filed,* (U.S. Oct. 22, 1984) (No. 84-648); *Bankers Trust Co.* v. *Rhoades,* No. 83-7636 (2d Cir. July 26, 1984), *petition for cert. filed,* (U.S. Oct. 24, 1984) (No. 84-657); *Furman* v. *Cirrito* No. 84-7113 (2d Cir. July 27, 1984), *petition for cert. filed, sub nom. Joel* v. *Cirrito* (U.S. Oct. 15, 1984) (No. 84-604), and because of the public importance of the question presented.

Respectfully submitted,

ARAM A. HARTUNIAN
(Counsel of Record)
HARTUNIAN FUTTERMAN & HOWARD, CHTD.
Suite 4005
55 East Monroe
Chicago, IL 60603
(312) 372-6475

---

[1] Respondents believe that Petitioners' statement of the question is unduly contentious and therefore misleading. Neutrally stated, the Question for Review is: Whether a civil claim for damages under RICO requires proof of injury greater than or different from injury resulting from offenses that comprise a pattern of racketeering injury. (See the Seventh Circuit's statement of "the central issue," Petrs' Appendix at p.A-1.)